UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/589,989 | 01/11/2007 | Paolo Monti | 294552US6X PCT | 2476 |
| 22850 7590 02/04/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. | | EXAMINER | | |
| 1940 DUKE STREET | | | ANDRISH, SEAN D | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 3672 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/04/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|-----------------|--------------|
| 10/589,989 | MONTI ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| SEAN D. ANDRISH | 3672 |

Application No. --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 20 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. 🔀 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Reguest for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL ___. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. 🔀 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below): (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. 🔀 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🔀 will not be entered, or b) 🗌 will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 17 - 26 and 28. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. 🛛 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _ 13. 🔀 Other: Applicant argues that Bertaccini (4,147,455) fails to teach or suggest "the tilting creates a lateral force acting on the

pipelines, in relation to the weight of the pipelines and an inclination angle of the upper surfaces, which predetermines a direction of a downward transversal movement of the pipelines on the upper surfaces of the supports." Applicant further argues that the supporting

system of Bertaccini completely limits the transversal movement of the pipeline and generates a system at a stable equilibrium. Examiner replies that the claims do not require the pipeline to be positioned on the support prior to the tilting of the upper surfaces of the

supports on which the pipeline rests. Therefore, if the pipeline were placed on the upper end of the supports (end adjacent pulley 15) after the supports were in position, the pipeline would experience a downward transversal movement on the upper surfaces of the supports until said pipeline came to rest against the upper surface of the wedge 10 (Fig. 1).

Furthermore, even if the pipeline of Bertaccini were laid on the support adjacent the upper surface of the wedge, the pipeline would still experience a lateral force acting thereon that pushes said pipeline against the wedge. Claim 1 only requires that the tilting of the support predetermines a "direction of a downward transversal movement" of the pipeline and does not require the pipeline to move in a downward transverse direction relative to the support.

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

/Sunil Singh/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3672

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20100122

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: An additional claim limitation has been added to claim 1 that requires further search and consideration.

/Sunil Singh/